DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 165 HE 004 180

TITLE	The Church, The University and Urban Society.
INSTITUTION	National Council of Churches of Christ, New York, N.Y. Dept. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	26p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027 (single copies $.50 each; ten copies or more $.35 each)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Church Responsibility; *Church Role; *Educational Responsibility; *Higher Education; School Community Relationship; *Social Responsibility; *Urban Education; Urban Environment

ABSTRACT

This document presents the report of a project designed to examine the relationship of higher education to urban society and to develop purposes and programs that the churches, community groups, institutions of higher education, and other organizations may pursue so that higher education in its various forms can be more responsive to the critical needs of urban life. The statement reflects a primary concern about the events in which campus and church interact in affecting urban society. Since other institutions, such as finance, business and government, exert enormous power in this society, the tasks of educational and religious institutions must be conceived with realism about such facts and with imagination about the forces that can shape the future. The three themes dealt with are (1) a vision for society, (2) the empowerment and the social dynamic required for people to achieve the vision, and (3) the work ahead for universities and churches in fostering that vision and that dynamic. (Author/HF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076165

THE CHURCH, THE UNIVERSITY AND URBAN SOCIETY

A Statement by the Commission on Church, University and Urban Society of the National Council of Churches

Morris Keeton, Chairman
William Cannon
Harvey Cox
Charles Doak
Brooks Hays
John Jordan
William Lovell
Arthur Paris
Hans Spiegel
George Todd
Charles Z. Wilson, Jr.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 120

Department of Higher Education
National Council of Churches

ED 076165

THE CHURCH, THE UNIVERSITY AND URBAN SOCIETY

A Statement by the Commission on
Church, University and Urban Society
of the National Council of Churches

Morris T. Keeton, Chairman

Department of Higher Education
National Council of Churches

Copies of this statement can be procured from the Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 10027.

Single copies – 50¢
Ten copies or more – 35¢ each

This statement may be quoted without special permission if credit is given.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
I. A VISION: PRIORITIES FOR OUR SOCIETY	1
A. New Strides Toward Self-Determination and Justice	1
B. A Coherent Pluralistic Society	3
C. A More Demanding Response to Rising Expectations	4
II. EMPOWERING PEOPLE TO PURSUE A NEW VISION	6
A. Coherence and Dispersion of Authority in a Just Society	8
B. Empowering the Constituencies of a Pluralistic Democracy	9
C. Empowering the Individual in a Complex and Massive Society	10
III. THE WORK AHEAD FOR UNIVERSITIES AND CHURCHES IN CHANGING URBAN SOCIETY	12
A. The Nature and Magnitude of Challenge Facing Churches and Universities	13
B. A Transformation of Churches and Universities	14
C. How Can Church and University Discover the Specifics of Their New Work?	18
Members of the Commission	20

INTRODUCTION

Early in 1969 the National Council of Churches commissioned us to carry out a project "to examine the relationship of higher education to urban society and to develop purposes and programs which the churches, community groups, institutions of higher education, and other organizations may pursue so that higher education in its various forms can be more responsive to the critical needs in urban life."

We were a group of twelve people with overlapping concerns and different ties with church, university and city. The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the National Council of Churches provided financial support for our work. It was a modest endeavor addressed to a monumental set of problems.

Our endeavor as a Commission took two forms: 1) To guide and advise a two-member staff who explored the implications of our task through research and through projects serving as probes in action. The two sought leads as to the ways churches, universities and community groups might best serve urban society. 2) To develop as a Commission a statement expressing our convictions on our theme question.

The staff of the project were Elden E. Jacobson and Parker J. Palmer, Senior Associates at the time in the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Washington, D. C. The Commission gave the staff advice, not directives. They were free to range in their work as the resources of the project and their judgment dictated. Their action-research and reflections, reported in seven booklets,* have contributed to the performance of our second task, but were not considered by the Commission for adoption as its own statement.

Our statement, which follows, represents the composite thinking of the Commission. There are nuances on which some members demur. Some feel, more significantly, that the tone of the statement is more sanguine than warranted, that the changes we advocate are more fundamental than the authority structure of our society will permit, and that in this sense the good will essential to the realization of these changes is lacking. The disagreement, then, turns not upon the substance of our findings and recommendations, but upon their prospects for implementation.

This statement is addressed particularly to leaders of higher education and of religious institutions in the United States. We include among these leaders the number who seek to create new institutional forms that break out of the limitations of the old. Our statement reflects a primary concern about the events in which campus and church interact in affecting urban society. Since other institutions–of finance, business and government, for example–exert enormous power in this society, however, the tasks of educational and religious institutions must be conceived with realism about such facts and with imagination about the forces that can shape the future.

Our three themes deal with A) a vision for our society, B) the empowerment and the social dynamic required for people to achieve the vision, and C) the work ahead for universities and churches in fostering that vision and that dynamic. This work includes tasks in the transformation of churches and universities themselves. In discussing each theme, we confine ourselves to a few thoughts on which we concur and place high priority. In this way we hope both to place emphasis upon what we see as most urgent and most important and also to avoid pretense of a greater completeness of either vision or program than our convictions in fact allow.

Morris T. Keeton
December 1, 1972

* The seven reports by Elden E. Jacobson and Parker J. Palmer were:

1. The Church, the University and Urban Society: A Problem in Power
2. The Church, the University and Urban Society: Focus on the Church
3. The Church, the University and Urban Society: Implications for the University
4. The Power of Development: Some Possibilities We See
5. Urban Curricula and the Liberal Arts College
6. Action-Research: A New Style of Politics, Education and Ministry
7. The Public Life: Its Decline and Renewal

The reports were published in late 1971, and are now out of print. Revision and reprinting are under consideration. Inquiries may be addressed to the Department of Higher Education of the National Council of Churches.

A Statement
on
The Church, The University and Urban Society

I. A VISION: PRIORITIES FOR OUR SOCIETY

There is an urgent need for campus and church to join in generating within America a new vision of its possibilities for human fulfillment. This vision will demand 1) a new order of magnitude of self-determination and justice for individuals and for sub-societal groups or subcultures, 2) a more coherent society which nevertheless shows greater respect than today for its pluralism of cultures, and 3) a more rapid pace of conceiving and bringing into effect the options for greater fulfillment that new understanding and resources put within our reach. This last demand will require reconsideration of the functions and the functioning of fundamental institutions such as marriage and the schools and re-design of such dominant features of society as our cities.

A. *New Strides Toward Self-Determination and Justice*

In a society regarded by its affluent majority as the freest and one of the most nearly just of our time, its most urgent need is for further major strides toward freedom and justice for all its people, and especially for its non-white and poor populations.

The effects of racial prejudice and economic inequities upon opportunity in the United States today are still of grievous magnitude. In per capita income, the gap between black and white was in 1972 still enormous. In housing, black Americans taken as a group pay more than whites for similar accommodations and are more likely to live in substandard dwellings, in slums and in high density areas. Segregation and discrimination continue to characterize education almost two decades after the Supreme Court declared segregation itself damaging to education. The system of justice itself works

inequity: blacks are arrested three to four times as frequently as whites and, once arrested, stand a greater chance of being jailed rather than bailed, convicted than acquitted and getting a heavier sentence for the same offense. Low income, poor education, bad housing and uneven justice in turn are factors in spawning the further problems of the city: With only one-ninth as many persons as whites, blacks have as many drug addicts, six times as many illegitimate children per thousand and three times as many fatherless households.

As the conscience of America has slowly awakened to beat back some of the most blatant forms of racial discrimination, a still more insidious form of discrimination has been disclosed. It is the habit of defining the conditions for opportunity and rights in ways that have the effect of racial discrimination. This is the racism of limiting access to professions on the basis of disqualifications which trace back to segregated housing and racial barriers to licensing and education. Where specific injustices are generated by an underlying social order, the removal of specific wrongs can simply be followed by regeneration of other and often graver forms of oppression. Thus as minorities gain power in metropolitan government, political boundaries are enlarged. Or as the poor get competent legal services, their attorneys and their funding come under attack, and the cry arises that law and order are threatened.

On two counts it is imperative that these conditions be corrected: They are a direct violation of the self-determination and justice to which our society is committed. They deprive the society of its most potent unused or underused resource for greater fulfillment, that of the thinking and valuing judgments and actions of the disfranchised people. Their effective voice and participation are indispensable in making the country's future what it should be.

The discrepancy between the promise of our culture and its realities is not confined in its impact to those most grievously offended. The racial majority, the middle classes and the suburbanites also feel powerless in many of their concerns. The result is a loss of the sense of a vision for the society which should be legitimated by the consent of all of its major constituencies. We are divided–about the war, about civil rights and about the distribution of economic benefits of our enlarging national product. No one in this Commission would want an end to controversy about national goals and priorities, but neither polarization nor an apathy growing out of disillusionment with the possibilities of influencing the public course will shape it well. Disagreement among members of a society about common policy is not to be equated with the evidences of hatred, greed and unconcern which mark the current political and social scene. We sense a growth of frustration, in some cases resignation and in others desperation, about this disillusionment.

The United States has the potential of far greater productivity of the things that make life good than even its present high mark. We believe, however, that for all of the unmet needs that should be met, we have even greater need to bring the voices and abilities of the disfranchised to bear in determining what the products of our labor should be and how they should be brought to bear upon individual and community well-being. To be heard and heeded is a right of every citizen, of whatever color, sex, race or culture. It must be a priority of this decade to bring our society to a new magnitude of fulfillment of this right.

B. *A Coherent Pluralistic Society*

America is not a melting pot. Its people do not wish to be one amalgam. We are many peoples, of diverse religions and differing heritages and cultures. We cherish both our diverse lives and identities and some common bonds and ways. Yet not every difference is good; so we are often at odds as to which things should be shared or common and which may be divergent. The issue may be how to respect civil rights and maintain order, how to organize for justice and uphold academic freedom, how to preserve cultural pride and desegregate the schools, or how to respect both religious differences and individual rights in the laws governing abortion and divorce. We cannot cherish poverty to foster diversity. Yet we will not impose an entire moral code or a style of life as the prerequisite of economic productivity and social cohesion.

At a time when federal authority has been used to enforce desegregation (though currently with uncertainty in the policies guiding it) there are spokesmen of ethnic minorities who demand "their own turf." "We do not want into your society," they say. "Do not come uninvited into our territory: we want our own language, our own community life, our own form of order. To be forced to take second best or to be forced to enter your society on your terms is offensive to both our tastes and our rights." How can those whose cultures are so divergent yet coexist peacefully and productively?

In battling these issues we are driven at times into antagonisms, even hatreds, which strike at mutual respect and undermine the will to work together in community. The forces that generate these issues, however, transcend the will or the ambition of the immediate protagonists in our factional conflicts. Therefore, we must not misunderstand these forces by abandoning or diminishing one another.

The amalgam of freedom with mutual concern and respect is the spiritual capital of our society. Its products are economic productivity, political and

social stability and widespread personal fulfillment. This amalgam calls for us to cherish diverse talents, interests, work, cultures and personal styles of life. We neither know the form which such a cohesive society of heterogeneity should take, nor how it is to be brought about. To come to know will require all the rationality our society can muster, and to achieve such a society will require political developments and alignments of power that can hardly be foreseen today. To accept the conflicts, the changes and the personal and institutional adjustments it will cause will require all the mutual forbearance we can muster. A pluralistic society of equal rights, equal opportunity and fruitful community is, nevertheless, now within our reach—only, however, if the power necessary to achieve it is mobilized and if the different interest groups in the society can begin to accept the larger goal. The achieving of this society should be our objective.

C. *A More Demanding Response to Rising Expectations*

The pace of change is growing. New technology puts ever larger and often more hazardous options before us. The choices grow more complex. The gap between the possibilities we see and the good we achieve widens. As national income rises, the gap between the poorest and the richest widens; and the gap between the industrialized and the non-industrialized nations grows. As mobility, access to education, and automation of work increase, the separation of the unskilled chicano migrant worker or the fatherless family from a life of significant fulfillment grows larger. To design the social changes which can right these wrongs will require knowledge and imagination beyond what we have previously used. As automobiles multiply and the use of energy per person escalates, environmental pollution threatens health and life. Thus the freedom to move and the fight against poverty and unemployment conflict with the demand for a healthful and beautiful country.

The response to this pace of change and to the vision of a just, coherent, pluralistic society must be one of an order of magnitude not previously contemplated with seriousness by the institutional church and university world. These two worlds must now join their forces more effectively than they have yet done. Again we do not hold church and university alone responsible or capable of the whole of the needed response. But our task is to point to their part of the responsibility. For example, in seeking to renew cities our past patterns of action have at best been ones of relatively uncoordinated efforts investing a few hundred million dollars per city. What is needed today, besides well-coordinated and newly designed strategies, is a new order of magnitude of capitalization, say, a few billions of dollars per city. The universities should be at work with governmental and entrepreneurial institutions conceiving and designing the transformation of the metropolis which such coordination and investment can produce. The

churches should be working with the universities to educate their constituencies about the moral imperatives which should govern such urban transformation. Both university and church should be working with their communities to develop together an understanding of the meaning of a more self-determining, pluralistic and just urban community.

The magnitude of response required to attain a substantially better way of life for America should not be measured in dollar investments and organization alone. It will require also a new order of ideas, ideals, attitudes and commitments. Too often we take for granted that old ideals will do or that common sense will enable us to adjust to change. Ethical judgment and spiritual leadership are not so easily developed. For example, our old ideals about the definition of criminality and the treatment of criminals are self-defeating in today's world. They cannot be made to work by more vigorous or by technically more sophisticated application. The very concepts and purposes they express must be re-examined. When they are so examined, they will be found to reflect in part the racism, the homogeneity of cultural outlook and the restrictions upon self-determination for individuals and subcultures which we have said must be replaced.

The magnitude of response requisite to a transformed America must also be seen with a new clarity as to its costs. These costs are not merely dollar costs or losses of conveniences. A new way of life offends at a deeper level. It is not realistic to think that those who should themselves change or pay for change will want to do so or be able to do so without a greater measure of help than has been necessary for the social changes America has undergone in the past–help that pushes, prods, interprets, reconciles, but insists. People and institutions will need preparation for, and support in sustaining their faith in themselves and in the potential of our society, during the inner and outer turmoil that goes with fundamental transformation. Both church and university will have important responsibilities in helping people to understand and to cope with the problems, the frustrations and the self-transformations demanded by a better, but basically different, way of life. Not the least of the difficulties will be the fact that this better way, though it will fulfill more nearly the pluralism, justice and freedom to which we have pointed, cannot be known in its particulars in advance, but must be conceived and created by a common effort.

II. EMPOWERING PEOPLE TO PURSUE A NEW VISION

By what dynamic can people be enabled by common effort to create and carry out a new vision for our society? We have no recipe for this dynamic, but we see three preconditions to be met by any dynamic adequate to the purpose: 1) a new division of labor between a central authority and local authorities in government, industry, education, church and other major institutions; 2) a new conception of the constituencies among whom power and influence should be shared in view of the ethnic, cultural and socio-economic composition of the society; 3) a new sophistication in evoking and empowering the voice of the individual participant and the coherent sub-groups in each community and institution of our society. Taken together, these changes imply the acquisition and exercise of power on the part of previously unempowered groups, both among urban minorities and among suburbanites.

No social system succeeds in getting complete efficiency in applying its energies to its ends. In today's urban society, however, we fail by so much to apply our full capacity to social betterment that an attack upon this failure is a key to that betterment. Sometimes we simply fail to share information and aspirations in a timely or effective way. We also fail to elicit the full commitment and energetic effort of many citizens because they feel excluded from, or diminished in, their due influence upon the choice of ends and means. We interfere with one another at other times because we do not recognize our shared ends, or because we do not agree as to how to achieve them. And, finally, we interfere with one another often because we seek conflicting ends or have differing priorities as to our ends. The mutual interference rooted in conflicts of purpose all too often goes beyond any utilitarian calculation of net advantage to purpose and ends, goes on into suicidal behavior, from that of small terrorist bands to the cold pursuit of war by national governments at a cost in human life and well-being that astronomically exceeds the carnage they deplore in guerrilla zealots.

In America we cannot solve this wastage of capability by letting someone impose ends. The combination of opportunity and capacity to help choose the ends is one of the most essential of our ends, and must be increasingly enjoyed as we work at defining and achieving the other ends. The exercise of this right of self-determination has its costs in other achievements—such as delays in decision-making and interferences in the execution of decisions which a free society permits. But the self-determining society creates a feedback that energizes people and fosters mutuality; and these effects yield benefits far beyond the costs of self-determination. Conversely, if citizens feel themselves deprived of the means of self-determination, the effect is to put a brake upon fulfillment. In this sense the old idea that the enfranchised society must be inefficient flies in the face of both ethical imperative and a growing body of social research.

Requiring a dynamic rooted in an enfranchised people, we have in fact a widespread sense of disfranchisement in America today. Whether or not voice in public affairs is greater here than elsewhere, or greater now than once, we have no doubt that both the sense of being heard and heeded and the actuality of having such influence can be substantially enlarged for both individual citizens and for interest groups and institutions. The task of bringing about that enlargement is of urgent priority.

This theme of the urgency of citizen empowerment is important for what it denies as well as for what it affirms. It denies that any one conception of the public good which might be espoused by this or that church or university, churchman or scholar, or groups of either or both should have priority over the aspiration that the power to make this choice be more effectively shared throughout our society. The priority upon citizen empowerment also denies that the enlargement of influence for those previously deprived will inevitably entail a loss of influence for others. Political and economic power is neither a fixed quantity nor a limitless resource. We concede that in some choices one party's gain is another's loss, as in the making of pork-barrel legislation. But there is also the choice to forego one advantage in exchange for a different one in order to permit another party's opportunity, as happens in credit transactions or in political bargaining. And better still for social cohesion are those choices in which one party sees the interest of another as his own, as in friendship or in creative and collaborative problem-solving.

If there is to be a new dynamic of empowerment of people to achieve a new vision of society, how is that dynamic to come about? In part by immediate steps to share power and influence. The 1972 political party conventions made a beginning of empowering women and ethnic minorities. Some colleges and universities have begun to struggle anew with the sharing of power among administration, faculty, and students and with the

according of access and voice to women and ethnic minorities. The churches continue a long but painfully slow struggle to root out their suppression of women, their segregation of races and their traditions of authoritarian or aristocratic governance. The Congress has begun to enact through civil rights legislation increasingly strict and broad requirements, both prohibiting certain forms of unjust discrimination and requiring affirmative action on behalf of women and minorities.

It is not sufficient, however, to share formal power. It is necessary, but not sufficient. Putting students on councils does not in itself alter campus power relationships. Requiring that faculty be consulted does not automatically improve the hearing of the administrators. Electing Black Congressmen or mayors, or appointing women commissioners or party chairmen will not by itself do much for enfranchising their constituencies. If the politics of civility means the continuation of old power relationships behind new facades, no great new society can be expected to result.

The needed empowerment of the people of a pluralistic society, as stated already, will require three types of change: 1) a new division of labor among authorities; 2) a new conception of constituencies sharing power; and 3) a new sophistication in empowering people. Presupposed in these steps is a vision of enlarging the good to be created and shared by the participants in this new dynamic. Also presupposed is a growth in realism about the politics of power: altruistic intent on the part of a few in power is no substitute for people's having the means to assert their own interests and to join in deciding how those interests may require to be accommodated to the interests of others and to a greater public good.

A. *Coherence and Dispersion of Authority in a Just Society*

How can social order and a coherent effort toward social betterment be achieved when a new pluralism of subcultures is emerging and a new effort toward dispersion of authority is afoot?

In matters which a society deems fundamental, it must have coherence, as in American constitutional rights. Though these rights change, and though at any given time there are uncertainties about their application, a basic guarantee of justice is centrally interpreted and enforced. Yet we have thousands of local ordinances and hundreds of state laws which differ in response to local conditions and populations and which, in reflection of local biases and weaknesses, also lag in fulfillment of the objectives of the society which this Commission envisages. The coherence our society seeks cannot, then, be entirely made by governmentally enforced constitutional or legislative enactments at national level. There must also be some coherence of ethic pervading both national and local institutions and practices.

Somewhere there is a better division of labor in policy making and in policy enforcement than we have found, and that somewhere itself must change in time. The answer, in so far as any answer can be found, is neither centralism nor its antithesis, but a continuing re-division of labor that reflects a working consensus of our society as to what the requirements of social order, justice and national character are and what the counterdemands of individual and group self-determination and fulfillment are. We have no dogma about a formula for that consensus. If our society has a pervasive failing, however, we think it lies in a tendency to assign a task or a problem altogether to either central authority or to grassroots rather than to tease out the more difficult invention of a productive division of labor between the two. When we cease to impose the white majority values upon Native American education, decentralizing the control of their schools and colleges, we cannot dispense with a national policy and its vehicle in central government to give that vision resource and protection. When we, by Congressional act or Supreme Court judgment, decree that racial segregation and discriminatory deprivation of rights shall cease, we cannot dispense with the building of a common ethic in support of racial equality.

B. *Empowering the Constituencies of a Pluralistic Democracy*

The forms of power and the instruments of influence in a complex society are many. When we set about rectifying injustice to women or to ethnic or cultural minorities or to the poor of all cultures and races, it will not suffice to correct a few highly visible instances of their disfranchisement. How will women be free at the polls and in their careers if they are enslaved at home? And how can they be freed at home if their bonds are rooted in local and state laws and in the employment policies and habits of every major sector of the economy? And how will these change if there is no attack upon both the institutional habits and the attitudes of men and women which support those habits? To empower them, as well as others, all must join in rooting out the sources of inequity in their many shelters: economic, political, domestic, psychological and social. The power to prevent as well as the power to enable must be confronted and turned to better ends.

A primary initial concern of this Commission was the continuing damage and injustice deriving from racial bias in America. Earlier in this statement we cite a few indices of the grossness of the injustices that persist. Access to jobs, to equal pay, to housing, to education, to legal services and the courts, and to political office—though improving—continue to be colored by bias of race. They continue therefore to distribute the consequent forms of power, resource and influence inequitably. As awareness of the injustices spreads, and as rectification lags even though it proceeds, the moral offense grows greater. Justice will not have the upper hand in these matters until the timing of rectification proclaims a deadly serious determination to end the offense.

Does the ending of such offenses by the empowerment of the disfranchised dictate a society organized along racial and cultural lines and a politicization of institutions, such as church and university, which hitherto were conceived as requiring political neutrality in order to perform their optimum role in society? In contemporary interdependent societies all major institutional endeavors have a political effect in either strengthening or weakening, supporting or undermining the surrounding and interacting political institutions. The School of Law which provides expert legal services to the poor, which they could otherwise not obtain, supports the adversary system of administering justice by its very conduct, and strengthens the society and community when its successes reduce the grievances of the poor and their disaffection. It does not follow that such schools need align themselves with party politics of one stripe or another or close their classrooms to advocacy for conflicting systems and ideologies about the nature and the administration of justice. The organizing of blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans to register to vote and to take control of local governments and school boards has been essential to the movement to end racial discrimination. It does not follow that blacks and other ethnic minorities will or should locate their sole or primary affiliations around race or ethnic identity. We believe, in fact, that the denial of justice on such bases as race, sex, ethnic identity, or the like is itself the primary cause of politicization around those same identifications. Once the injustices go, the principal fuel for polarization goes with them. In some cases, such as those of economic injustice, moreover, the most effective organization to attack bias is organization which itself transcends the barriers created by that bias.

C. *Empowering the Individual in a Complex and Massive Society*

The most powerful organizations can collapse when the individuals who sustain them either give up or turn against them. Industry, we are told by a growing body of research, is most productive in complex and non-routine enterprises when sustained by a widespread participation of its workers in influencing its decisions and its modes of operation. In most institutions, however, from the family through the schools and colleges to industry and government, we are still in a rather primitive stage of understanding how to elicit the perceptions, the ideas and the concerns of the individual and to heed them in the ordering of the work of those institutions. Only recently has substantial attention begun to turn upon strengthening the family to accommodate its generational and sexual pluralism to the mutual advantage of its members and to greater cohesiveness of the whole. Not until the sixties did campuses become generally aware of a crisis of legitimacy in the eyes of students and of the public. Perhaps in the seventies the force of public opinion will press the nations sufficiently to begin to make the waging of war an unmanageable policy. Whatever one's position on the forms of family,

university, or political life, it is clear that governance more responsive to those affected and concerned must be devised for them all and with the participation of them all.

Is this aspiration itself, however, manageable? When the average black or chicano is as empowered as the average WASP, will either then be free? When the average student is as empowered as the average administrator, will the university be better governed? When the average individual has the degree of weight here advocated, what becomes of the capability of political leaders to lead well? The empowerment we advocate is not one that would ignore knowledge, experience, competence and disinterestedness. No one wants a new tyranny of ignorance, inexperience, incompetence and special interests. As individuals and groups are heard and heeded in a substantially novel measure, the roles of expertness and the balances of public priority, coherence and justice must also be sustained. New constituencies must grow in openness to one another and to old constituencies, and all must grow in self-restraint if leaders are to function as they should. Again we pretend to no nostrums. We say only that these risks must be seen and confronted. We cannot turn away from the vision our society needs nor from the empowerment of people implied by that vision merely because the risks are so grave and the means of their avoidance still unknown. The alternative risk is graver, and its avoidance impossible.

III. THE WORK AHEAD FOR UNIVERSITIES AND CHURCHES IN CHANGING URBAN SOCIETY

If church and university are critically needed in the re-shaping of urban society, but have neither the right nor the competence alone to determine its priorities and its directions of change, what work and what roles can they appropriately perform? Our answer to this question turns upon a view of the respective competences of churches and universities and upon a view of the functions which they can helpfully perform in a creative division of labor within American society.

High among the expectations of church and university, taken together, in American society are a moral and spiritual function on the one hand and an intellectual function on the other. The university more than any other institution, though not to the exclusion of others, is charged to engage in disciplined, systematic, sustained inquiry and reflection, without restriction because of who is affected or what uses are at hand. Of religious institutions, but again without excluding others, is expected an unremitting quest for meaning in existence, for a vision of the right and the wrong and of their implications and consequences, and for a choice between the better and the worse and a commitment to the better and more meaningful alternatives for mankind. Spiritual, moral and intellectual functions cannot be healthily divorced from one another in their exercise. Yet no one of these functions can be realized as it should be unless institutions other than the church and the university accept and use their contributions.

The separation of church and state within a mutually respectful collaboration, while never a completely clear principle in its application, is one that we cherish as a source of strength for both the spiritual and the political life of the country. Similarly in education and in moral and spiritual leadership a division of labor and a sharing of services as between state, church and educational establishment need clearer articulation and firmer implementation if similar strengths are to be achieved in their interplay.

The staff of this Commission devoted much effort to an analysis of the resources of church and university for useful interaction with the people and the other institutions of urban America. They sought to see how the competences (e.g., in inquiry and in moral concern), the socially conferred sanctions (e.g., in credentials as to degrees and in religious symbolism), and the other resources (in access to opportunity as well as in monetary and other means) of church and university could be applied to facilitating the development of alternative urban, religious, and educational institutions and to the reform of existing institutions. The staff findings and recommendations are embodied in the booklets mentioned at the outset of this statement. Their work and our own reflections seem to us to call for a statement on three aspects of the work now needed from church and university in the changing of urban society: 1) on the nature and magnitude of challenge which we think should be presented to church and university, 2) on the transformation in them which we think necessary if they are to respond adequately to that challenge, and 3) on an approach to the specific responses implicit in that challenge and transformation.

A. *The Nature and Magnitude of Challenge Facing Churches and Universities*

We cannot rightly paint all churches and all universities with the same brush. As an aggregate, however, churches and universities have allowed their function and their genius to be eroded within the past two decades. We call for a renewal and a resumption of role on their part.

To resume their rightful significance, churches and universities must address the elements of a vision of new values for our society (Section I) and the problems in a dynamic of empowering people to strive toward those values (Section II). Honestly and deeply to probe the meaning of a new level of self-determination and justice, of shared values in a pluralistic society, and of rising expectations for human betterment–honestly and penetratingly to press these questions is both an intellectual and a moral and spiritual undertaking of the most demanding order. In this undertaking there is no place for churches or campuses that are focussed primarily upon their own immediate prudential interests and concerns, as so many today are. The churches must take self-examination and re-commitment to a new life in utter earnest. And the universities must turn inquiry in its most searching light upon these most difficult issues of value and priority.

The choice of most significant agenda is not the most difficult task now before churches and universities. They must also make headway on that agenda. To conceive of fruitful strategies for enabling the people of this country to move forcefully toward a substantially improved society is even more difficult. To decentralize while sustaining coherence, to empower the disfranchised without oppressing the former oppressor, and to enable

individuals to have and to exercise influence without defeating one another and losing their mutuality – these tasks also present enormous intellectual and moral challenge.

The magnitude of the challenge we see must also be understood. The challenge, as one of our members put it, is to bring about "quantum jumps" in the vision and the improvement of the quality of life in American cities. A quantum jump is not just coasting along, but it is also not so large as to go completely out of the orbit of coherence. It means a step that is large, significant ethically and expressive of the new priorities and values foreseen. For example, adding a few ethnic minority students and faculty members is not enough; open admissions and re-shaping of staff for a whole network of universities is a step of the magnitude we mean. We cite the example not to suggest that it is the best for its purpose, certainly not to suggest that it is sufficient (success after admission is critical if admission is to be worth gaining at all). The example merely illustrates the magnitude, significance and direction of effort we advocate.

B. *A Transformation of Churches and Universities*

Churches and universities, it might be argued, are, of all the possible institutions from which to hope for significant social change, among the least promising today. Why has it required the federal government to intervene for the rights of blacks and women? Why not the church or the university? Why has a threat from legislatures been necessary to awaken universities to their deficiency in undergraduate teaching and disaffection from clientele necessary to force private colleges to reform? And why can such economically weak institutions as churches and universities provide the muscle to press for the needed magnitude of social change? Because, we think, among the critical roots of our current societal crisis are the society's governing concepts and its moral and spiritual priorities, and we see no other institutions as ready and able to respond to these particular needs. At the same time we grant that a transformation of the church and the university will also be requisite to their making an adequate response to those needs.

What is the transformation required of churches and universities? It is not the same for the two types of institutions in every respect, but some elements of the requisite change are similar. First, as either church or university becomes large enough and influential enough to shape society, it also takes on the coloration, biases, priorities and perspectives of that society. How can the patient heal himself? Only if the society itself cherishes self-criticism, cherishes a larger universe than itself and commits itself to continuing renewal and transformation will it tolerate and use religious and intellectual institutions with those same characteristics. Since these are not yet the

dominant characteristics of our society, risk and sacrifice are implicit in the determination for churches and universities to lead into such a society by first remaking themselves. The particular churches and campuses which have attempted such change have already experienced some of its devastating costs. What has happened to those who acted upon the proclamation of the obsolescence of war? And how can the others have been expected to separate in legislative minds and congregational hearts the unwarranted gambits of students or ministers from the warranted steps in wakening the public to the danger of human extinction?

The capability of church and college to withstand public attack, the capacity at the same time to distinguish between proper exercise of their role and its abuse, and the capacity to interpret this difference to sanctioning publics must be strengthened if their work in renewal is to be effective. This work is a first part of the needed transformation.

The transformation required of church and university also goes against the grain of their own constituent members. A sect or a small private college can avert this dilemma by its relative purity with respect to a particular concern—a Mennonite sect in its devotion to peace, a private college in its zeal for educational reform. But a church or a state university is in the nature of the case one of predominantly conventional values. At the same time the two have the advantage that their distinctive missions open even their average members to the moral and intellectual search needed by the society and thus provide a seedbed for the development we here bespeak. The seedbed will, however, not function as seedbed unless it is given nutrient and cultivation to this very end. Would black churches have carried so heavy a load in the movement for racial equality if the seedbed of other church life was the good ground it should have been?

The task we see for church and university also pits them against external forces which they will need the strength and resource to combat. In part this strength and resource can be created by coalition among church and university forces. The distance they have kept from one another is by no means a requirement of the American law of separation of church and state. The strange fright of church-sponsored colleges and universities with respect to the prospect of being religiously distinctive has surely cost them in intellectual strength as well as in moral integrity. If the problems of the city are conceptual and moral as well as technical—and few would today deny that they are—then a union of the best resources in each of these worlds—the church and the university—is essential to problems of the magnitude we face. Thus an immediate correction of this isolation is mandated.

The magnitude of opposition to church and university influence is also in part an effect of their self-definition as beyond help from other elements of

urban society. If the university cannot learn from the city's people and its other institutions, the university will isolate itself. The isolation will in turn create ignorance, insensitivity and offense. How can a university pursue outdated labor practices, intrude destructively upon surrounding urban communities with its building programs, function as a slum landlord and become a citadel within a hostile ghetto if it is learning what it should know and feel from its own neighbors? How at the same time can a college pretend to be in touch with the world in which it is preparing its students to live if it is either removed in location or, when in contact, acting as neutral researcher hurriedly picking samples and returning to isolation to study its find? The consequences of this growing isolation of campus from city are by now all too clear. The campus must reconceive the sources of data and ideas for understanding its social environment. The result may or may not dictate a change in where the campus is, but it will unavoidably dictate a change in how the campus interacts with its urban society.

The estrangement of campus and city is also an effect of who makes up the campus. The community college movement has done much to mitigate the sense of separateness between city people and the university world. The major research universities and selective private colleges, however, have remained until recently almost inaccessible to inner city populations. Recent affirmative action stimulated by civil rights legislation and by internal pressures has begun to change the composition of student bodies and faculties, but with some professional schools enrolling only 3% or fewer blacks and employing an even lower proportion of black faculty, the university world is far from being equipped in its personnel to generate in city populations an end to the earlier estrangement.

In their locations and in the make-up of congregations and ministries, the churches have been on the whole less alienated from city people than the universities, though hardly by early choice and vision. They were rather prone to flight, slow to respond to their changing urban environment, belatedly awakened to the opportunity around them, and still later able to bring leadership to the use of the opportunity. Both church and university should now make a more serious and competent effort to combine resources with others who make up the cities to create better modes of urban life.

The transformation process for religious and educational institutions will be traumatic if pursued with the vigor it should have. It will mean accepting intergroup conflict as a vehicle of defining and becoming committed to the changes that emerge as needed, rather than denying the need, "buying off" dissent with token reforms, or uncritically yielding to ill-conceived and inadequately analyzed or implemented demands. Old styles of hierarchical governance will be threatened. Conflict will extend not only to specific causes proposed for espousal but also to the sense in which such espousal is an

improper politicization or a breach of internal democratic control or institutional tradition. The needed transformation of both church and university will also mean their asserting, locally as well as regionally and nationally, a leadership function without pretense of a monopoly of either the right or the capability to lead. Few churches or universities are organized for such leadership or have defined for themselves a purpose or self-concept suited to it. For them to lead calls for the hammering out of such purposes and concepts and the mustering of intellectual, moral and spiritual insight and strength from every possible quarter, rather than the continuation of a prideful role rooted in professional or ecclesiastical advantage.

The needed leadership by church and university calls also for reestablishment of dynamic relationships between churches and secular educational institutions. The strong movement toward separation of church-related colleges from all church control may continue to a virtual sweep, but it need not imply isolation nor a decline of spirituality in academe. On the contrary, it can become the beginning of a newly creative collaboration rooted in independence and mutuality, just as the partnership between campus and church on the one hand and other urban institutions on the other must also be characterized by autonomy and mutual respect.

The transformation of church and university will be difficult in a further way. It will require a commitment in action prior to certainty of either having the truth or having the full-bodied right within grasp. We can know only in part. This transformation will, in a word, call for experimentation, for frontiersmanship, not in just any well-meant change, but in ventures that have participation, leadership, consent and ongoing evaluation from the urban communities affected. It will require advocacy which threatens old ideas about the proper ways to be "good" without being "partisan" or to do searching inquiry without becoming subversive. It will go so far as to make the churches and the universities instruments of delivering power to those who have not enjoyed it or who have had less than they deserved, and to make them in their own policies reflect these same changes of authority and influence relationships. All of this will be done, not by transgressing into the precincts of political organizing and lobbying on the part of church and university institutions, but by delivering the competencies and credentials of inquiry and moral leadership into the hands of those who have lacked those resources. In the action-research projects of our own staff and of a few campus and church groups there are already models for the type of experimentation and partnership required by this type of change.

Finally the transformation will change within universities and churches their own concepts of their own highest standards. The processes and criteria for accreditation in higher education have been, not merely irrelevant to the generation of such a new vision and empowerment as this Commission

advocates, but positively inimical to such change. Those processes and standards have blocked or delayed more equitable admissions, more appropriate definitions of curricula and certificates for different campus clienteles, more productive definitions of faculty duties and of competent faculty performance and better conceived measures of success in learning and maturing on the part of students. Nor will these processes and criteria change as needed until the monopoly in the setting of standards is wrested from organizations which still reflect the defects which we have already decried in the society at large. The evaluators must themselves be evaluated, and by those who are now seen as more appropriately filling the role of judges.

The churches have a similar, if less easily grasped, problem of credentialing. Who, if anyone, may rightly pronounce for the church itself as to the ideals and the ways which deserve divine sanction? It is, however, not necessary to settle Catholic-Protestant controversies as to who is God's vicar nor intra-Protestant disputes as to the proper forms of church authority in order to know that the mores of acceptability for membership and leadership in the life of the church have been awry. The failing of our society has not been simply a falling away from long adequate ideals, but a limitation inherent in the very ideals themselves. The racism, privilege and authoritarian patterns cited in Section II of this statement are sufficient testimony to this point. For the ideals of the church itself have carried bias, indifference, limited concern and exclusiveness within themselves.

In pressing for a transformation of church and university, we do not advocate their becoming political parties, governmental agencies, or propaganda mills. Churches and universities should not be fickle and faddish. They must be capable of intense involvement in the life and problems of the metropolis without subordinating their unique functions to that involvement. That involvement, in fact, will be most valuable, not for its immediate utility, but for the new depth and competence it can induce in church and university in their ongoing spiritual, moral and intellectual functions. So undertaken, the role that we propose can refresh and enliven both church and university without the presumption that either should overtly or covertly rule this pluralistic and complex future which we envisage.

C. *How Can Church and University Discover the Specifics of Their New Work?*

Neither church nor university is monolithic in the United States. We would be the last to wish that either should be. Therefore, we come to specifics with some hesitation. To our sponsoring organization, the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, we must nonetheless say: To conclude this endeavor by circulating reports and thanking their authors would merely

accentuate the retreat from responsibility which we have decried. We advocate rather that this challenge is worthy of the Council's risking its own existence: either reconstitute yourselves to make this task primary, or establish a permanent and well-supported vehicle for the purpose. Provide a charge and the means to commission ventures, to conduct education and to elicit leadership in this cause. Do not wait for others alone to risk the commitment or meet the costs.

To other similar organizations we offer a similar concern. The ills we have delineated strike at the souls of men and enslave their minds. Ministry to the people demands that the ills and the alternative possibilities be confronted, and in force.

To the universities we venture a similar challenge. Have your great studies adequately questioned the moral grounds of your whole endeavor? Have you not the understanding and the courage to see that it is a waste of both your own substance and of the people's means and faith in you for you to plod along at the present rate of response to their doubts? Let there then be both research and innovations that address the challenge. In separate papers, members of this Commission have spelled out specific proposals for innovation which, out of our own experience and concerns, seem of promise and high priority. But these will merely illustrate what many must attempt. It is not our challenge, but one that is in the realities of today's society to see. The challenge is growing in the forces that shape the future so that its control and redirection become daily more difficult. Let there be mutual consultation, conferences, and then joint endeavors which share the risks and share the task of designing efforts worthy of risk. But whatever the modes of response, let us move closer into the work of shaping urban society than tradition has allowed. Do it with greater openness as to what is best than convention has blessed. And give priority greater than before to the task of conceiving whole new ways of life for the American people and to the task of enabling men to prepare themselves for these new ways of life. For what our times need is not more efficient means to our ancient aims, but alternative visions of the future, uniting men of many cultures and persuasions in a new mutuality with a new multiplicity of methods and technologies.

So also can the churches work more closely than ever with the community in both its immediate and its timeless problems. Let the churches draw more heavily than before upon the intellectual resources of colleges and universities. And, without pre-empting either political authority or citizens' rights to their own moral and spiritual freedom, let the religious communities show greater faith than of late in their capacity to bind the larger community together and to elicit and cultivate prophetic vision and action from its constituents.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON THE CHURCH, THE UNIVERSITY AND URBAN SOCIETY

Morris T. Keeton, Provost and Vice-President, Antioch College, Chairman

William B. Cannon, Vice-President for Programs and Projects, University of Chicago

Harvey Cox, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard Divinity School

Charles W. Douk, Campus Minister, University of California at Los Angeles

Brooks Hays, Director of Ecumenical Studies, Wake Forest University, former Congressman from Arkansas

John Jordan, Executive Secretary, University and Young Adult Ministries, National Division, Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church

William N. Lovell, Executive Director, Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches

Arthur Paris, Graduate Student, Northwestern University

Hans B. C. Spiegel, Professor of Urban Affairs, Hunter College of the City University of New York

George E. Todd, Associate for Urban and Industrial Ministries (Board of National Missions), and Secretary, Joint Office of Urban and Industrial Ministries (with COEMAR), United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

Charles Z. Wilson, Jr., Vice-Chancellor–Academic Programs, University of California at Los Angeles

Staff of the Commission:

Elden E. Jacobson, Director, Institute for Public Life, Silver Spring, Maryland

Parker J. Palmer, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Georgetown University

During the project both men were Senior Associates in the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Washington, D.C.